

DIDERMOCERUS BROOKES, 1828, v. *DICERORHINUS* GLOGER, 1841, (MAMMALIA: RHINOCEROTIDAE), AND THE VALIDITY OF A CATALOGUE OF THE ANATOMICAL AND ZOOLOGICAL MUSEUM OF JOSHUA BROOKES, 1828. Z.N.(S.) 1779

By Patrick J. Boylan (*Kingston upon Hull Museums, High Street, Hull, England*)

The purpose of this application is to request the Commission to determine whether the name *Didermocerus* Brookes, 1828, (*A Catalogue of the Anatomical and Zoological Museum of Joshua Brookes* . . . : 75), or the name *Dicerorhinus* Gloger, 1841, (*Handbuch Naturgesch.* : 125), is to be used for the recent and fossil rhinoceros genus in question. In doing so, it will be necessary to consider whether *Didermocerus* Brookes was validly published.

2. Since *Didermocerus* and *Dicerorhinus* share the same type species: *Rhinoceros sumatrensis* Fischer, 1814, (*Zoogn.* 3 : 301), they are clearly objective synonyms, although Gloger incorrectly attributed the authorship of *Rhinoceros sumatrensis* to Cuvier—an understandable mistake. During the 19th century, most authors referred all rhinoceroses to the genus *Rhinoceros* Linnaeus, 1758, but in the present century the junior synonym *Dicerorhinus* Gloger has frequently been used both for the extant *Rhinoceros sumatrensis* Fischer, and for a number of stratigraphically important fossil species.

3. In 1945, G. G. Simpson (*Bull. Amer. Nat. Hist.* 85) rejected the prior name of *Didermocerus* largely on the grounds of disuse, saying (p. 142): "The first name applied to the genus was *Didermocerus*, but this was never used and can reasonably be left in desuetude on the convenient, if somewhat sophisticated grounds that its appearance in a sales catalogue was not publication . . .". However, Simpson was not entirely consistent since at the same time he accepted the name *Acinonyx* Brookes (Mammalia: Felidae) which Brookes proposed in the same work. (If the present International Code had been in use at the time, Simpson could reasonably have asked for the suppression of *Didermocerus* as a *nomen oblitum*.) Ellerman & Morrison-Scott, 1951, (*Checklist of Palaearctic & Indian Mammals, 1758–1946*), rejected Simpson's claim that *Didermocerus* was not validly published, saying (p. 339): "Simpson (1945) calls this *Dicerorhinus*, and suggests, somewhat half-heartedly, that the name *Didermocerus* may conveniently be dropped, on the ground of its publication in a sale catalogue. This in itself is no bar to "publication" within the meaning of the *Règles*, and the catalogue was on sale to the public for half a crown. Moreover, Simpson adopts *Acinonyx* which appears in the same publication." As a result of its use in Ellerman & Morrison-Scott's authoritative *Checklist* the name *Didermocerus* has been, to some extent, restored to use so it cannot now be regarded as a *nomen oblitum*. However, the majority of zoologists and nearly all palaeontologists have continued to use *Dicerorhinus*.

4. The Commission could stabilize the position in any one of three ways. Following Ellerman & Morrison-Scott, the Commission could accept Brookes' *Catalogue* as a genuine publication within the meaning of the Code. This would, however, cause some disturbance since *Didermocerus* is still used far less

frequently than *Dicerorhinus*, although the use of *Didermocerus* is now increasing. Secondly, the Commission could accept Simpson's argument, and regard Brookes' *Catalogue* as invalid for purposes of nomenclature. It might then be necessary for the well-established name *Acinonyx* Brookes to be validated by the use of the plenary powers. A less logical third alternative would be to explicitly or implicitly accept Brookes' *Catalogue*, but suppress *Didermocerus* under plenary powers. In my view, this alternative has little to commend it except that it would stabilize the prevailing usage without disturbing *Acinonyx*.

5. The Commission is therefore requested to consider three alternative sets of proposals, as follows.

Alternative A

The Commission is requested:

- (1) to place the following work on the Official List of Works Approved as Available for Zoological Nomenclature:
J. Brookes, 1828: *A Catalogue of the Anatomical and Zoological Museum of Joshua Brookes* . . . (etc.);
- (2) to place the generic name *Didermocerus* Brookes, 1828 (gender : masculine), type-species, by monotypy, *Rhinoceros sumatrensis* Fischer, 1814, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
- (3) to place the generic name *Dicerorhinus* Gloger, 1841, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology, as a junior objective synonym of *Didermocerus* Brookes, 1828.

Alternative B

The Commission is requested:

- (1) to place the following work on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature:
J. Brookes, 1828: *A Catalogue of the Anatomical and Zoological Museum of Joshua Brookes* . . . (etc.);
- (2) to place the generic name *Dicerorhinus* Gloger, 1841, (gender : masculine), type-species by monotypy, *Rhinoceros sumatrensis* "Cuvier" = Fischer, 1814, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
- (3) to place *Didermocerus* Brookes, 1828 on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology, on the ground that it was published in a Work declared to be unavailable for purposes of nomenclature under (1) above.

Alternative C

The Commission is requested:

- (1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Didermocerus* Brookes, 1828, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy;
- (2) to place the generic name *Dicerorhinus* Gloger, 1841, (gender : masculine), type-species by monotypy, *Rhinoceros sumatrensis* "Cuvier" = Fischer, 1814, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
- (3) to place the generic name *Didermocerus* Brookes, 1828, (as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.